



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER OF PATENTS AND TRADEMARKS
Washington, D.C. 20231
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/853,787	05/14/2001	Akihisa Murata	Q64434	7102

7590 11/29/2002

SUGHRUE, MION, ZINN,
MACPEAK & SEAS, PLLC
2100 Pennsylvania Avenue, N.W.
Washington, DC 20037

EXAMINER

ZIRKER, DANIEL R

ART UNIT

PAPER NUMBER

1771

DATE MAILED: 11/29/2002

8

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

09/853,787

Applicant(s)

Murata et al

Examiner

Daniel Zinker

Group Art Unit

1771

—The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet beneath the correspondence address—

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE -3- MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, such period shall, by default, expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).

Status

- ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 11/1/02
- ☒ This action is **FINAL**.
- ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, **prosecution as to the merits is closed** in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 1 1; 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- ☒ Claim(s) 1-5 is/are pending in the application.
- Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- ☒ Claim(s) 2-5 is/are rejected.
- ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction or election requirement.

Application Papers

- ☐ See the attached Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review, PTO-948.
- ☐ The proposed drawing correction, filed on _____ is ☐ approved ☐ disapproved.
- ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are objected to by the Examiner.
- ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119 (a)-(d)

- ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d).
 - ☐ All ☐ Some* ☐ None of the CERTIFIED copies of the priority documents have been received.
 - ☐ received in Application No. (Series Code/Serial Number) _____
 - ☐ received in this national stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

*Certified copies not received: _____

Attachment(s)

- ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s), PTO-1449, Paper No(s). _____
- ☒ Notice of Reference(s) Cited, PTO-892
- ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review, PTO-948
- ☐ Interview Summary, PTO-413
- ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application, PTO-152
- ☐ Other _____

Office Action Summary

Art Unit 1771

1. The text of those sections of Title 35, U.S. Code not included in this action can be found in a prior Office action.

2. The Examiner would like to briefly mention that due to the admittedly sometimes confusing PTO Rules, applicants' cancellation of independent claim 1 and the rewriting of formerly dependent claim 3 as the only independent claim in the case has necessitated a requirement to cancel claim 2, since independent claim 3 upon which it is now dependent has a higher number. Claim 2, however will be examined in this Office action.

3. Claims 2-5 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over either Japanese Patent Abstract -164 or applicants' alleged admissions regarding the prior art on page 1 of the specification, each taken in view of Derwent Abstract XP -577, substantially for the reasons set forth in paragraph No. 3 of Paper No. 6, together with the following additional observations. Independent claim 3, as noted above, is now the only independent claim in the case and also requires the presence of a roughness parameter. However, as was previously set forth, this resulting structure is believed to be within the skill of the art. Additionally, note again U.S. Patent Application Publication -515 teaches at page 2, paragraph 12 that superior adhesion can be obtained when surface roughness of one micron or finer exists.

Art Unit 1771

Applicants further argue, however (Response, page 4-5, bridging paragraph) that the data set forth in the specification in the Table at page 31 establishes unexpected results. However, the Examiner must respectfully disagree. Applicants' specification on page 29 discussing what is the only Comparative Example in the case appears to state that it is substantially identical, i.e., "same procedure as in Example 1" to at least Example 1 except for the absence of a conductive powder (PASPRAN 5110S). Thus, the adhesive properties of the two Examples would be expected to be about the same, and in fact the Table results appear to indicate that the Comparative Example was both slightly rougher, and also has a slightly greater Adhesive force before heating. However, as to the inferior antistatic properties referred to (Response, page 5, lines 4-9), such would clearly be expected from the absence of the conductive powder in the Comparative Example.

4. The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure. The Examiner has also been able to obtain machine translated copies of the entire text upon which both Japanese Patent Abstract 11-166164 and 09-208910 (the latter being the disclosure upon which XP -577 is based) and has made them of record and forwards a copy of each to applicants.

Art Unit 1771

5. **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL.** Applicants are reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 C.F.R. § 1.136(a). The practice of automatically extending the shortened statutory period an additional month upon the filing of a timely first response to a final rejection has been discontinued by the Office. See 1021 TMOG 35.

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR RESPONSE TO THIS FINAL ACTION IS SET TO EXPIRE THREE MONTHS FROM THE DATE OF THIS ACTION. IN THE EVENT A FIRST RESPONSE IS FILED WITHIN TWO MONTHS OF THE MAILING DATE OF THIS FINAL ACTION AND THE ADVISORY ACTION IS NOT MAILED UNTIL AFTER THE END OF THE THREE-MONTH SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD, THEN THE SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD WILL EXPIRE ON THE DATE THE ADVISORY ACTION IS MAILED, AND ANY EXTENSION FEE PURSUANT TO 37 C.F.R. § 1.136(a) WILL BE CALCULATED FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THE ADVISORY ACTION. IN NO EVENT WILL THE STATUTORY PERIOD FOR RESPONSE EXPIRE LATER THAN SIX MONTHS FROM THE DATE OF THIS FINAL ACTION.

6. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Daniel Zirker whose telephone number is (703) 308-0031. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday-Thursday from 8:30 A.M. to 6:00 P.M. The examiner can also be reached on alternate Fridays.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Terrel Morris, can be

Serial No. 09/853,787

-5-

Art Unit 1771

reached on (703) 308-2414. The fax phone number for this Group is (703) 872-9310.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the Group receptionist whose telephone number is (703) 308-0661.

Dzirker:cdc

November 21, 2002

DANIEL ZIRKER
PRIMARY EXAMINER
GROUP 1300

1700

Daniel Zinker